REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 19, 2006. Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

By the Office Action, claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0154723 to Liang. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Liang is directed to a system that assists in categorizing search results. Liang takes a search term or terms and uses other meanings to sub-categorize the search. The example given in Liang refers to the search term: Jaguar. This may include, e.g., the animal or the car. The system of Liang breaks down the search term into these two (or more) categories and performs an independent search in each category. The search term is preprocessed to derive the different categories before the search is actually conducted. Ontologies or predefined categories and sub-categories are used to create a hierarchy of categories and sub-categories based on the search terms provided by the user. (see page 5, paragraph [0058]). These categories can even be edited manually by the user before the search is performed (see paragraph [0058]). The search is then performed in accordance with the keyword matches from the hierarchy. The results are displayed separately for each category. This is completely different from the present invention as set forth in the presently pending claims.

For example, claim 1 includes, *inter alia*, a method for organizing document search results including identifying words in raw search results documents having an

association with search query terms; categorizing features of the words in relation to the search query terms to determine presentation categories based on the search query terms and presenting the results in at least one category in accordance with the features.

The method first identifies words in the raw search results related to the search query terms. So that the words in the search result documents are related to the search query terms. These words that are related to the search query terms are employed to categorize features of the words in relation to the search query terms to determine presentation categories based on the search query terms words. So that the related words in the search result documents actually become the categories for which the results are displayed. This is not disclosed or suggested by Liang.

In accordance with the present claims, a search is performed and then features in accordance with the corpus of documents are used to the categorize documents. Nowhere in Liang is such a step or steps disclosed or suggested.

In Liang, the categories are defined based upon the search terms entered by the user. The search terms are expanded or modified prior to the search being performed. The categories that are employed to classify the search terms are defined in advance of the search even being performed. It is therefore, respectfully submitted that Liang fails to disclose or suggest the present claims as set forth in claims 1-8. Reconsideration of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claim 9 includes additional features not disclosed or suggested by Liang. For example, claim 9 includes, *inter alia*, a method for presenting search results including searching one or more documents in a corpus of documents to retrieve documents as a result of a query

term matching with a matched token in one or more of the documents; selecting at least one document term in a set of the document terms, the document terms being in proximity to the matched token; categorizing the selected document terms into at least one category to provide the at least one category which is related to the search query term; describing the categories using one or more category terms; and presenting a hit list of the documents with the one or more category terms associated with each of the documents.

In accordance with claim 9 (as in claim 1) a search of one or more documents in a corpus of documents is performed to retrieve documents as a result of a query term matching with a matched token in one or more of the documents, then at least one document term is selected that is in proximity to the matched token. The selected term from the document is used to categorize the terms into at least one category to provide the at least one category which is related to the search query term. This is not disclosed or suggested by Liang.

Claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, a document search presentation system including a feature extractor configured to extract and select features within documents provided in accordance with a search query, a feature categorizer coupled to the feature extractor, the feature categorizer associating the features in the documents to categories in accordance with taxonomy categories, and a format, which presents at least a portion of the documents in association with a category of the taxonomy categories. Nowhere in Liang is a feature extractor disclosed that extracts selected features from the search result documents. In addition, nowhere in Liang is a feature categorizer disclosed that used features already extracted for the searched documents to categorize the search result documents. Since Liang fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the present claims, claims 1, 9 and 18 are believed to be in

condition for allowance for at least the stated reasons. Claims 2-8, 10-17 and 19-22 are believed to be allowable as well at least due to their dependency from claim 1, 9 and 18 respectively. However, it is also submitted that the dependent claims are believed to be allowable over the cited art for other reasons as well. Reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the case is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's IBM Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/16/07

By: _____
James J. Bitetto
Registration No. 40,513

Mailing Address:

KEUSEY, TUTUNJIAN & BITETTO, P.C.
20 Crossways Park North, Suite 210
Woodbury, NY 11797
Tel: (516) 496-3868
Fax: (516) 496-3869